

Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

Broadcast by 300 Stations of the ABC Radio Network



J. S. Pat. Off.

Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

Who Will Win in November?

Moderator, QUINCY HOWE

S p e a k e r s

JACOB K. JAVITS

WALTER WILLIAMS

JOHN F. KENNEDY

EMANUEL CELLER



—COMING—

—August 12, 1952—

**Is the United States By-Passing
the United Nations?**

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 36, N. Y.

VOLUME 18, NUMBER 11



\$5.00 A YEAR, 15c A COPY



Town Meeting

Vol. 18

No. 11



Who Will Win in November?

The Broadcast of July 29, 1952, from 9:00 to 9:45 p.m., over the American Broadcasting Company Radio Network, originated from the Ritz Theater, New York City.

The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of views presented.

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

REP. JACOB K. JAVITS—Republican of New York, member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Congressman Javits was born in New York City in 1904, and received his law degree from New York University in 1926. Admitted to the New York bar in 1928, he became a partner of the law firm, Javits and Javits. He has practiced as a trial lawyer, and was special assistant to the Chief of Chemical Warfare Service of the United States Army from 1941 to 1942. From 1942-45, he served in the European and Pacific Theaters of War and was discharged as a lieutenant colonel. He was elected to Congress in 1946. Mr. Javits has sponsored legislation for protection of civil rights, for televising and broadcasting of House sessions, and against segregation and discrimination in public-supported education and in the armed forces. He has written many articles on political subjects and is well known as a lecturer.

REP. JOHN F. KENNEDY—Democrat of Massachusetts, member of the District of Columbia Committee and Education and Labor Committee. Born in Brookline, Mass., in 1917, Mr. Kennedy attended Harvard University, graduating with a B.S. cum laude in 1940. He joined the Navy in 1941 where he served in PT boats in the Pacific until 1945. Mr. Kennedy, son of the former ambassador to Great Britain, Joseph Kennedy, is the author of *While England Slept*. He has also been a newspaper correspondent. He was elected to the 80th Congress in 1946, has been re-elected to succeeding Congresses.

WALTER WILLIAMS—National Chairman of Citizens for Eisenhower; former chairman of the Washington State Republican Committee. A native of Monroe County, Iowa, Williams was born 55 years ago. After attending school in Denver, he entered the University of Washington, receiving his B.S. in chemical engineering in 1916. After Army service during World War I, he taught high school for two years. In 1921, Williams became the first employee of Continental, Inc., a Seattle mortgage, banking, insurance, real estate and property management firm. He is now serving as its president. Williams is former chairman of the Committee for Economic Development. For this non-profit, non-political

(Continued on page 15)

Town Meeting is published weekly at 32 S. Fourth St., Columbus 15, Ohio, by The Town Hall, Inc., New York 36, New York. Send subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, New York 36, N.Y.

Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, (Canada, \$6.00); six months, \$3.00, (Canada, \$3.50); eight weeks, \$1.00, (Canada, \$1.20); 15¢ a single copy. Entered as second-class matter May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Copyright, 1952, BY THE TOWN HALL, INC.

Who Will Win in November?

Announcer:

Now that the political conventions are over, and the two major parties have chosen their candidates, we turn our attention to the presidential election campaign and the issues involved.

Tonight we're discussing the question, "Who Will Win in November?" with spokesmen for both parties. As a nonpartisan educational institution, Town Hall does not take sides in political discussions. However, in arranging these Tuesday night discussions, we make every effort to present clearly every viewpoint on the important issues so that you may give them careful consideration and make up your own mind.

The purpose of Town Meeting is not to tell you for whom or for what to vote, but rather to give expression to ideas and qualifications in order to stimulate your own thinking and thus help you make your own decision. So be sure to join us every Tuesday night, hear all sides, and make up your own mind.

And now to preside as moderator for tonight's discussion, here is Quincy Howe, ABC Network commentator, author, and Associate Professor of Journalism at the University of Illinois.

Moderator Howe:

You do not have to be a speaker on tonight's Town Meeting to have an answer to the question, "Who Will Win in November?" but the four men we brought together to give their answers speak with such authority that I'm sure that each one can sum up his views in an opening statement of not more than two minutes.

So first, let's hear from Walter Williams, National Chairman of

Citizens for Eisenhower, former chairman of the Washington State Republican Committee, former chairman of the Committee for Economic Development. Mr. Williams, why do you like Ike in early November, as well as you did in early July?

Mr. Williams:

Thank you, Mr. Howe. My answer to the question as to who will win in November is that I believe sincerely that the winner will be Dwight D. Eisenhower. Now I don't say that from a bombastic braggadocio standpoint at all. I believe it with all my heart, and I believe it can be supported by good, valid reasons.

In any campaign, there are always a good many minor issues, and there will be a few major issues. Tonight in this brief introductory statement I should like to mention three of the major reasons that I believe that Eisenhower will win.

The first is because, I think, that we've already been given a tip-off by our opponents that they're going to play the theme, "I've never had it so good." In other words, they're going to play the prosperity theme, and during the course of this evening's discussion, I hope we shall be able to develop the fact that in my belief and my earnest opinion this prosperity is a false or phony prosperity. I don't ask you to take my word for it. I ask you to examine into your own family affairs and compare—when you think of taxes and high prices—what your condition is today versus, say, ten years ago.

The second reason, I think, is that we have the tip-off for it in the theme song of the recent

Democrat Convention: "Don't let them take it away from us." Now I think that that in itself smacks of vested privilege and the corruption with which officials in high places have expressed themselves in recent months, and I think the people are rather disturbed on that point, too.

And the third and the most important reason of all why I think that Dwight D. Eisenhower will be elected in November is because with all my heart I believe that Dwight Eisenhower is the very best hope for peace that America has at the present time. And during the course of the discussion this evening I want to develop that.

These all add up then to the fact that I believe that the American people have an increasing sense of urgency as to the need for the right kind of a decision this fall, and that decision in my opinion will be the election of Dwight D. Eisenhower. (*Applause*)

Mr. Howe:

Thank you, Mr. Williams. Next I'm going to call on John F. Kennedy, Democratic Congressman from Massachusetts since 1946, now Democratic candidate for the Senate. Mr. Kennedy is the son of former ambassador Joseph B. Kennedy. He's an author, newspaper correspondent, and Navy veteran of the war in the Pacific.

Now why, Mr. Kennedy, do you predict that the Stevenson-Sparkman ticket means another four years of Democratic rule in Washington?

Representative Kennedy:

Mr. Howe, it is my firm conviction that the Democratic party under the leadership of Governor Stevenson and Senator Sparkman will win this coming election. I would not have made this statement

with the same confidence before the Chicago convention, or even on Tuesday or Wednesday of last week, when it appeared as though the alliance of the different groups that President Roosevelt had welded together might break. But the Democratic party stood the test and merged united under Governor Stevenson.

My confidence in the future is based in part on the positive program with which the Democratic party has met and is prepared to meet in the future the many grievous problems that face contemporary America.

After 20 years of Democratic leadership, the United States is economically stronger than at any time in its history, as opposed, not to the depression year of 1932, when President Roosevelt assumed office, but the former peak year of 1929, when our national production stood at 168 billion dollars.

Our national production today is 328 billion dollars, and in terms of the 1929 dollar, our national product is almost double that of 1929, and this prosperity is now shared by the great majority of Americans.

In that prosperous year of 1929, 36,000 families received as much income as 11,600,000 families. That has been changed, for today our prosperity is more equally shared, though much remains to be done.

I am confident of victory, also, because of the extraordinary American who was drafted last week by the Democratic Convention—Governor Adlai Stevenson. He will do much for the party, of which I am a member, but even more for this great country when he is elected, as I am confident he will be next November.

Mr. Howe:

Thank you, Mr. Kennedy. And we hear now from another Congressman who also served in the Second World war and in Congress since 1946. Representative Jacob K. Javits is a Manhattan Island Republican who went from law into politics, and in politics has specialized in promoting civil rights legislation among other things. Now why, Mr. Javits, do you believe 1952 will be a Republican year?

Representative Javits:

Well, first and foremost, Mr. Howe, I believe 1952 will be a Republican year because of the man whom the Republican party has presented to the American people.

What the American people are worried about is whether we can meet the Russian challenge and maintain the peace. There is no leader in the world who equals Eisenhower in terms of the confidence which the people of the whole world—not just of the United States—have in him to do that job; and that in my mind will determine the presidential election of 1952.

Now in addition to that some big things have happened in the Republican party too at this national convention we just had in Chicago. For one, the rank and file of the party, which has the opportunity to express itself at a national convention only once every four years, showed by a solid majority that it's modern, that it's responsive to the needs of the country and to America's leadership position; that it's not isolationist; and that it's not reactionary.

Though this confounded the experts, I doubt that it confounded the people who knew it all along,

because over 24,000,000 Americans voted the Republican ticket in 1948, and they're certainly a cross-section of the people—not a class. And what happened in Chicago showed that the Republican party, rank and file, is determined to renew itself as a party, to clean out the dry-rot, and this should inspire the American people.

I think the contest to seat modern, vital, and truly representative elements speaking for Republicans in Georgia, Texas, Louisiana and Florida, instead of seating out-moded Republican state machines, meant that the Republican party is ready to fight for a two-party system in the South. And I think the decisive vote to prevent contested delegations from voting on seating each other showed that the Republican party's rank and file not only means to denounce immorality in the Democratic party, but means that they want their own house in order, too.

I think to ordinary Americans, it's been clear for some years that the American people have been troubled by a steady string of Democratic party victories seriously endangering the two-party system, one of the foundations of our republic. Our people have just seen the Democratic party coming apart at the seams from sheer complacency and being in office too long.

Yet, we know that the Republican party could not win a national election until it deserved to win. I believe that under General Eisenhower's leadership, the Republican party will deserve to win and that the Chicago Republican party convention showed that the party is getting ready to achieve that victory.

Mr. Howe:

Thank you, Mr. Javits. Now

our fourth and final speaker is also a Congressman who comes from Brooklyn, not Manhattan. He belongs to the Democratic party. Emanuel Celler is rounding out 30 years of continuous service in the House of Representatives. Before that, he practiced two other professions—law and banking.

Mr. Celler, you've heard what the three other speakers had to say. How would you more or less sum up the case for a Stevenson victory?

Representative Celler:

Well, I admit the Republicans are very much troubled with the repeated victories of the Democrats, but the people of the United States aren't. (*Applause*) I agree with the next Junior Senator from Massachusetts, my dear friend Mr. Kennedy here, that the Democratic party will win with Stevenson and Sparkman in November.

With our liberal platform and Governor Stevenson's outstanding qualities of leadership, we cannot miss. His rugged honesty, his liberalism, his political adroitness, his oratorical powers were so ably displayed in his campaign for the Governorship of Illinois that he won by a landslide victory of 572,000 votes.

He is now headed straight for the White House, and wonder of wonders, in addition to his stimulating delivery of speeches, he even can write them.

His speeches have the Wilsonian touch of towering phrases. His humility is profoundly expressed, and his convictions portrayed with impressive strength and delicate humor. I am convinced he will give the American people speeches that will not only thrill them with a breath of vision, but sink deep into the heart and mind. He has been steeped in civilian

service. He has been eminently successful in many important assignments with the AAA, the Navy department, the State Department, and the United Nations. He headed missions that required him to circle the globe. He was instrumental in blueprinting the technical arrangements for ushering in the United Nations at San Francisco and London. The knowledge and experience he has gained as Governor will be invaluable.

In contrast, we have the guileless and the naivete and the civilian inexperience of his opponent that even a General's baton cannot wave aside. Stevenson is direct and revealing. His opponent is content with woolly platitudes. Governor Stevenson's opponent hoped to be drafted. He wasn't; he had to fight indecorously. Stevenson secured without effort the draft he humbly dreaded. Eisenhower was easily persuaded that he possessed qualifications for an office whose burdens, as Stevenson said, staggered imagination.

Stevenson and our Democratic party will indeed triumph in November. (*Applause*)

Mr. Howe:

Now, let's go back down the group again and let Mr. Williams, who talked first, have the first shot in rebuttal.

Mr. Williams: Thank you, Mr. Howe. I would like to make a comment with respect to Mr. Kennedy's reference to the fact that the economy is stronger today than it has been at any time in the history of the United States. I just don't think that is so. And let me just explain to you why I think that is an incorrect statement.

In the first place, we have a debt, a national debt, of someplace over

a quarter of a billion dollars, about a quarter of a trillion dollars, about 260 billions of dollars. That means nothing to any of us who are listening now or who are in this room, because we don't know how much a billion is, let alone 260 billion.

But practically translated, we can understand it a little bit better when I say that means 1700 dollars for every individual in this land, and that means approximately 7,000 for every family in the land. That debt represents a first mortgage upon every thing that everybody in this country owns. I don't consider that that's prosperity, and I don't think that represents economic soundness.

I make this further observation, that the guy who has been the forgotten man in this whole business as the result of inflationary prices and mounting tax burdens is the fellow who has tried to save and has bought government bonds, insurance policies, the widow who has had an annuity, pensioners, the school teacher who has saved and saved and saved and then finds when she goes on retirement that her pension plus the return on her savings just doesn't add up to enough to keep her alive—that is simply because of the product that has come from the economic mismanagement over these last 20 years.

And I repeat that I think Mr. Kennedy's statement that we are economically stronger than ever before in history is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. Howe: What's the answer, Mr. Kennedy?

Rep. Kennedy: Well, I think that I'm concerned like Mr. Williams about the national debt, but let's find out how we really got that debt.

We got 20 billion dollars of it from 1932 to 1939 in an attempt to cure the ravages of depression. Since 1946, through several good years, we have not increased that debt from 1946 to 1951. This year we did, because of the Korean war, go over about $3\frac{1}{2}$ billion dollars, so that the great percentage of that debt, over 200 billion dollars of that debt which concerns us all, was built up during World War II, which was certainly not a partisan debt, but an obligation which all Americans must accept as part of the burden of winning World War II.

Now we maintain that debt at a cost of 5 or 6 billion dollars a year, which is the interest we pay on the debt. I think we can handle it, though obviously we're all concerned about it, but a country with an income of 330 or 340 billion dollars, Mr. Williams—the President's Economic advisor has talked about 400 billion dollars by 1960—I believe, can handle it. And if we get some peace in the world and maintain our prosperity, we can begin to reduce it. But I certainly do not blame the debt on the Democratic party.

Rep. Javits: You're apparently just dealing in fancy figures and talking about the budget instead of talking about the tax burden on the people. That isn't what you Democrats are trying to do right now, telling the people that Stevenson's going to make a clean sweep and that he's to tighten everything up and see that the real economy is practiced and that a decisive end is put in some fashion by a better foreign policy to the enormous expenditures for defense, etc.

And what we say to you is if you are going to make a clean sweep, if the American people are going to make a clean sweep, they'd better get a new, clean

crowd to do it, and Stevenson's pretty speeches aren't going to cover up the mess and the corruption and the immorality which the American people have seen in the Democratic administration these past years. Now it just can't be done. If there's going to be a clean sweep, then the man to do it is a new man and a new party. (Applause)

Rep. Celler: I'm not one of those who are going to sell America short and the gentlemen to our left, the Republicans in this gathering, failed to take into consideration the great assets of our Nation and our incalculable resources. We can't disregard figures, Jack. You know, if you look at the figures, that our total production advanced from 167 billion dollars in 1929 to 327 billion in 1951; that our corporation profits, after taxes, in 1929 were \$8,400,000,000 and they advanced in 1951 to 18 billion dollars.

If we can't stand that debt that you speak of, then I don't know how to examine a bank statement, and I think you know how to examine a bank statement. You take the assets and liabilities of this great Nation of ours and the tremendous wealth of the individuals, not only in this audience but in the whole country. Their wealth can't be disregarded—their tremendous potency and power to create wealth. Why, the amount of our debt is piddling in comparison.

And our good friend, Mr. Williams, just thumped the string that was thumped in 1948, when he said that we never had it so good.

We heard the Republicans say that in 1948, and the Nation paid no attention to their theme song. So ask the worker and ask the mechanic and ask the tenant and

ask the veteran and ask the housewife and ask the small business man. They'll tell you that they've never been better off in their lives than they are now. They were far better off in 1948 than they had been theretofore, and that's why in their common sense they voted for the Democratic ticket and they're going to vote for it again. (Applause)

Mr. Howe: Suppose we get off quite so many figures, ladies and gentlemen, and get down to the actual reasons why the American people are going to vote Republican this time, Mr. Williams.

Mr. Williams: Well, I think the reason the American people are going to vote Republican is because of the fact, as I indicated in my opening statement, they are increasingly aware of the fact that the policies that have been pursued by the New Deal and the Fair Deal are leading them down the road to ultimate disaster.

Now part of what is involved and what we were discussing about a moment ago, I think, might take a little elaboration. Actually, the figures were given by our Democratic colleagues. I believe Mr. Kennedy said that our national income now is some 340 billion of dollars. Well, to start out with, you've got to cut that in half because of the fact that the dollar is worth about half of what it was.

Then starting beyond that, you've got to remember that a whale of a big slice is taken out by taxes that has never been taken out before, so that the net position that each individual has is far, far less than it would be as reflected by these figures which they bandy around.

Now I think that one of the most important things of all is

that we tend here in America to take a look at the Socialistic government that was in Britain before the Churchill regime, and we don't like that and we don't like the dictatorial regimes that were in Germany and Italy and so on, and we don't like the confusion in France. Actually, the situations that were brought about in those countries were the direct result of the wreckage and the wrecking of their economic systems.

And just as sure as we sit here tonight, if the policies which have been pursued as far as our economies are concerned are continued, we will end up without the slightest question of doubt with the loss of our liberties which give our present American way of life.

Rep. Kennedy: You wouldn't pretend to tell the American people that we are going to be able—whether General Eisenhower is elected President or Governor Stevenson—to reduce the tax burden within the next two or three years. Isn't it a fact that 85 per cent of our budget is now devoted to the cause of either paying the cost of previous wars, of paying the cost of a tremendous national defense burden, or paying the cost of a large foreign aid program which General Eisenhower has supported? That any attempt to cut, which the Republicans attempted to do in the last Congress in the Kuter amendment when they cut our Air Force appropriations from 21 billion dollars to 17 billion dollars in the House by a vote of 159 to 11, which would have stretched out our 143 air groups from 1955 to 1957—Congressman Javits knows that it would be impossible to carry out any marked degree of economy, certainly, for the next two or three years—while the Russians remain a major threat.

Rep. Javits: Now Congressman Javits would like to answer exactly that question. You've put your finger on why the Republicans ought to win. You see, you Democrats have given up on it. You can't do anything about it. Now let's break that down. You've got 85 billion dollars in budgetary requests and appropriations. I'm for an Eisenhower who knows the army inside and out—squeezing water out of that 52 billion dollars or that 85 billion that's going into defense. And it can be done.

Now the Congress can't do it with a meat axe, and I voted against it just as you did, because I didn't believe that the Congress could sit in the President's chair and do the job of contracting the defense budget. But the President can, and I'm for getting a President who knows how to do it.

What I say in this: Sure,—even if you assume that the social reforms of the last 20 years were essential, nevertheless, in order to consolidate those gains, you've got to answer the twin fears of the American people—the fear of war and the fear that inflation is going to sweep away every gain they've made, and it's progressing that way every day.

And therefore I feel that the American people want somebody who's going to take this thing by the throat and correct it. To have a New Deal all around, you've got to have a Republican administration. They're the only people who are going to make a clean job of it.

Rep. Celler: Well, let's consider for a moment the man who is supposed to take the helm and see how often he suffers from attacks of foot-and-mouth disease. For example, . . .

Rep. Javits: That's pretty rough on General Eisenhower. We didn't

say that about Governor Stevenson, and I don't think you should say it about Eisenhower.

Rep. Celler: Well, I certainly will say it, and say it with all the power within me, because you can't make a politician, a man qualified to be President, in a period of two or three months. Why, he is fenced in and is a prisoner of his past! He doesn't know anything about the domestic scene. (*Applause*)

He was asked, for example, what he thought about farm parity and the farm problems, and he answered probably without even thinking, and again he put his foot in his mouth while he said, "I'll have to ask the farmers." What does he think they're going to tell him?

Then he was asked again what he thought about the depletion allowances for oil operators, the great oil tycoons. He said he didn't know anything about it, he'd have to ask his friends who are oil operators. What do you think they're going to answer him when he asks that kind of a question?

And when, for example, he was asked about segregation, he shilly-shallied a bit and gave us another woolly platitude that I speak of.

And again he put his foot in his mouth when somebody said to him: "Do you know that the Japs are selling all kinds of products to Red China?" What was his great answer? He said, "Well, you can expect that from all businessmen, I have no complaint."

Then when he was accused of saying something that was quite contrary to the foreign policy, his own policy, then he backtracked. Well, now we're not going to pay for the education of General Eisenhower. (*Applause*) It's too big a price to pay.

And as to the figures that Mr. Williams reverted to, I'll tell you why we're going to win. There are 22 million die-hard Democrats in this land. There are 18 million die-hard Republicans. That gives you some edge immediately of 4 million and where are the 1,100,000 voters who voted for Wallace going? Are they going to the reactionary Republican palace guard that surrounds General Eisenhower—like McCarthy, who addressed the convention, and Kem, and Watkins and Harry Cain and men of that stamp and character? Why, that General will be fenced in by those men. He'll be as helpless as a blind man looking for a black hat in a dark room. (*Applause*)

Mr. Williams: Mr. Howe, there are a good many things I'd like to say by way of reply to Mr. Celler's remarks. In the first place, concerning his last statement about Mr. Eisenhower being fenced in. He just isn't the kind of guy that gets fenced in, and I'd like to have that upon the record. (*Applause*)

Rep. Javits: Mr. Williams, may I interrupt you? You know in this long tirade of Mr. Celler's he failed to state why the Democrats nominated—the great party of Civil Rights—a man who comes from a Dixiecrat state and is against Civil Rights for their vice-president, John Sparkman. How are they going to answer that one?

Rep. Celler: I was on the platform committee with Senator Sparkman and he helped us shape that very plank in the platform on Civil Rights, and he said he stood four square on that Civil Rights platform.

You asked for an answer, you'd better take it now. He wants to change the provision so it will do

away with cloture rule, the rule 22. Your party doesn't say a word about filibuster and doing away with filibuster. John Sparkman forthrightly and courageously said, "I want to do away with filibuster." He said as we all said, that you can't bring about Civil Rights reform with that kind of a rule in the Senate. That could prevent the passage of any Civil Rights legislation. He said, "I'm willing to do away with that rule. I want to stand on this platform and will fight for that platform throughout the length and breadth of the Nation."

Rep. Javits: It's the record that we've got to go by, Mr. Celler, and the record is that John Sparkman has stood against Civil Rights and he stood for the filibuster in the Senate, and that's what you've got to go by.

Mr. Kennedy: Now, Mr. Javits, isn't it a fact that General Eisenhower has stated that he believes in leaving it to the jurisdiction of the states—in his public statements, since he's come back? And Number Two, most people seem to feel that it's the Senate rules which have stopped the passage of an effective FEPC.

Now when we reported out of the Education and Labor Committee in the House the FEPC bill three years ago, the McConnell bill, which took out of it the police powers and substituted voluntary action, was passed in the House by a vote of 124 Republicans to only 42 against. In other words, it was the House Republican membership that defeated compulsory FEPC, not the Senate rules, even though my good friend Jack Javits, I know, was on the opposite side, as he has been the strongest Republican in support of Democrat programs in the last 6 years.

Rep. Javits: May I answer the Civil Rights thing? I'd like to answer that that particular FEPC bill was the only FEPC bill that ever came out of either House of Congress, weak or not, and it came out of a Republican Congress. Now the answer is that the Democrats know that . . .

Rep. Kennedy: You're wrong. I think it came in 1950.

Rep. Javits: It was the 80th Congress, I'm sorry. No, sir, it came out of the 80th Congress—the only time that any FEPC bill came out of the House.

Rep. Celler: How'd it come out?

Rep. Javits: It came out on petition.

Rep. Celler: Now why don't you men subscribe to the petition?

Rep. Javits: You wanted me to take it. Well, you take it for a minute.

Rep. Kennedy: Believe me, you're wrong. It came out on February 22, 1950.

Rep. Javits: I'm not talking about the bill that was voted on in the House. That was a '48 bill. It came on a discharge petition. Mr. Celler has referred to it.

Rep. Kennedy: I'm talking about the bill that came out on February 22, 1950.

Mr. Javits: That wasn't voted on. It was in the House.

Mr. Howe: Before we go into our question period, I'm going to give Mr. Javits just one minute to finish the point he was making.

Rep. Javits: My point is that the Democratic party appropriates the Civil Rights issue, knowing that it has built within itself 50 per cent of the membership in the House and Senate—the Southern representatives and the Southern Senators—which are the bedrock

of prejudice and will not let Civil Rights go through. The only way you're ever going to get Civil Rights legislation is if it ceases to be appropriated as a party issue and becomes an issue upon which coalitions of liberals and progressives on both sides can legislate. I think it's a disservice to the whole Civil Rights issue that it's appropriated by the Democratic party as its private issue.

Mr. Howe: Thank you, Mr. Javits. And now Mr. Celler, you can have the same amount of time in reply.

Rep. Celler: One would think, of course, that all virtue resides in the Republican party. I can assure you as chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House which has jurisdiction over most

Civil Rights legislation, that I have been sorely put to it constantly to get that kind of legislation, not only out of sub-committee, but out of my own committee, so it can be debated on the floor of the house. Why? Because of an unholy alliance between the so-called Dixiecrats and the members of your party, Jack. They're just as guilty as the Dixiecrats with reference to bottling up and preventing Civil Rights legislation from passing.

Now, furthermore, I want to answer Mr. Williams . . .

Mr. Howe: Mr. Celler, we can't go on any more. We have to give our audience a chance now to get their questions in. Let's have the first question, and it's addressed to Mr. Williams.

★

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Man: Mr. Williams, do they call the Republican party presidential candidate "General Eisenhower" because every time you ask him a specific question he gives a general answer?

Mr. Williams: No, I think it's because of the fact that the large general percentage of the population is going to vote for him next November. (Applause)

Mr. Howe: The next question is addressed to Representative Kennedy.

Man: Representative Kennedy, do you feel that Governor Stevenson's being divorced will adversely affect the number of votes he will receive from such predominately Catholic communities as Boston?

Rep. Kennedy: Everyone has to face that problem themselves. I don't believe that Governor Stevenson's divorce will adversely

affect his voting strength, nor should it. He was divorced after a long period of marriage by his wife on the grounds that she didn't like political life after he became Governor of Illinois. He has not remarried and therefore it does not seem to me that that should disqualify him in the minds of the people. There are other qualifications of Governor Stevenson's that are so pre-eminent that I believe that it will not adversely affect him in cities like Boston.

Mr. Howe: Here's Mr. Williams wanting to say a word.

Mr. Williams: I just wanted to say this. I'm speaking now from the Republican angle and I would like to say that I don't think that the question of religion has any business entering into this debate at all. (Applause)

Mr. Howe: Thank you, Mr.

Williams, and now the next question for Mr. Javits.

Man: Congressman Javits. In 1948 and before that, New York's liberal party has supported you in Congressional elections. I want to know if the liberal party is going to support General Eisenhower in 1952.

Rep. Javits: The Liberal party? I don't know what they will do with respect to the presidency in 1952. That is, of course, their complete decision. They are a liberal party. As a result they never inhibit me and the people that I support for the presidency, and they have supported me on my record as a Congressman. I tried very hard to earn their continued support and I'm very happy to say that I have it in 1952 and that I'm that kind of a Republican.

Mr. Celler: I can tell the gentleman who asked that very pertinent question that the Liberal party is definitely going to support Stevenson and Sparkman. (*Applause*)

Mr. Howe: And now there's a question for you, Mr. Celler.

Man: Congressman Celler, how can you expect the people of America to vote for the star, when the star of your party doesn't want the job?

Rep. Celler: Well, I believe that Governor Stevenson, from the deepest sort of his humility, felt that he was not qualified, and another great president felt the same way and acted almost similarly to Governor Stevenson when he was spoken of for this great preferment, the Presidency of the United States. I refer to no less a personage than Abraham Lincoln. He wrestled with his conscience and finally came up with the view that because he revered so highly the office of the presidency of the

United States, he felt that he could not refuse it. You may remember in his acceptance speech he quoted a very famous phrase: "*If this cup will not pass by unless I drink thereof, Thy will be done.*"

Mr. Javits: May I just comment on that? It seems to me that we respect Governor Stevenson as much as we feel the Democrats ought to respect General Eisenhower, but it's only fair to say that Governor Stevenson did not submit himself to the searching cross-examination by the American press and the American public that General Eisenhower submitted himself to—and I think there's a great deal to be said for General Eisenhower on that count, especially that he's almost fearless in the world and so recognized as a great leader. (*Applause*)

Man: Mr. Williams, do you think that the voters—labor and other large groups, including the farmers—will shoot Santa Claus in November?

Mr. Williams: Well, that goes back to my earlier statement. I think that the American people are slowly awakening to the fact that they can't get something for nothing; and increasingly, as the percentage of the population comes to that conclusion, increasingly are the chances that General Eisenhower will win in November.

Man: Mr. Kennedy, can you show the generosity to think of the possibility of forming bipartisan foreign policy under the leadership of the Republican party?

Rep. Kennedy: Well, I would hope that if the Republicans should win that that part of their policy which is right would be bipartisan. I don't think that bipartisanship should be a one-way street. Men like Congressman

Javits who have supported the present foreign policy and have made a contribution in forming it have a right to expect that if their party should be successful, the Democrats, as far as they could and believed it right, should share in it.

Man: Congressman Javits, how can you reconcile the record of the Republican party in Congress with Eisenhower's personal record of international cooperation as the emissary of two Democratic presidents?

Rep. Javits: It is my view that Eisenhower will lead, not follow, the Republican party; and I think the Republican party's platform bears that out. The Republican party platform comes out for an international leadership policy, and I think that that's one of the reasons why I say that the American people have been shown a rank and file attitude on the part of the Republican party which is distinctly not isolationist, and distinctly in the direction that Eisenhower himself has taken and in which he has been a great leader.

Mr. Celler: Could I answer that question a bit further and elucidate, if I may? With reference to Jack Javits saying that the general will lead. I wonder how much leading he can do when, for example, we consider those who will be chairmen of the very important committees of Congress. For example, if the Republicans win, the Chairman of the Expenditures and Executive departments will be no less a personage than Joseph R. McCarthy of Wisconsin, who called Marshall a traitor and Ike a liar; and head of Finance, will be Eugene Millikin, the moss-back conservative, and Judiciary will be presided over by Senator Langer, woolly-eyed. The

Governor of North Dakota declared a moratorium on all debts. And foreign nations will be controlled in the Senate by Alex Wiley, Senator from Wisconsin, recently a rabid isolationist, and public works would be controlled by Harry P. Cain; a model for the original old guard elephant with thick skin and mind to match. How can he lead with those kind of men in key positions in the Senate?

Rep. Javits: Mr. Celler, people who throw stones should not live in glass houses. (*Applause*) If the Democrats win, Mr. Barden will continue to be the chairman of the committee on Education and Labor of the House, dead set against federal aid to education to which the Democrat platform is pledged and the author of the infamous Barden Bill.

Mr. Murray will continue to be chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee which has given our Civil Service employees one of the worst deals they ever knew of, and Mr. McCarran will continue to be chairman of the judiciary committee in the Senate who has perpetrated the infamous McCarran bill and the immigration bill, and Mr. Celler, you yourself can't control your own committee. You fought them yourself on the immigration issue because of present Senate.

.....
Rep. Kennedy: It was the coalition of Southern Democrats and Republicans which have ruined the Administration.

Rep. Javits: It's you people who threw the stones on that issue, not we. (*Applause*)

Mr. Howe: A short question for Mr. Kennedy.

Man: Mr. Kennedy, can you explain how you feel the Democrats

will win this November with Senator Sparkman on the ticket who opposes Civil Rights?

Rep. Kennedy: Well, I think that Mr. Celler answered that. He accepted the language of the platform of 1952, which is certainly as strong if not stronger than 1948, and Governor Stevenson's attitude toward civil rights and civil liberties are certainly strong, much stronger, I believe, than General Eisenhower's. We have the South—128 votes. We have 12 states which have gone Democratic ever since 1932. We have ten more states, six of which were carried by President Truman, three more which would have been carried if Henry Wallace hadn't won, and I believe that the Democrats are going to win their greatest victory this year since 1940, if not 1936.

Rep. Celler: With reference to what my good friend John said concerning civil rights, General Eisenhower would want to cure

civil rights, the evils of civil rights, with just rose water and kind words. Governor Stevenson says he wouldn't consider a compulsory FEPC, for example.

Rep. Javits: Well, now, you can't gild a lily on Sparkman. Sparkman is a Southerner from a state that went Dixiecrat and has been against civil rights in the Senate, and as far as the Democratic party is concerned, it hasn't got the votes to deliver. The Democratic party hasn't got the votes to deliver, and yet it makes it the big issue. Now General Eisenhower doesn't make it his big issue.

Mr. Howe: Now we've got to stop. Thank you, Mr. Williams, Congressman Javits, Mr. Kennedy, Congressman Celler, for such a lively presentation of your respective parties and candidates.

So be with us next week and every week at the sound of the Crier's bell.

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

(Continued from page 2)

organization of leading businessmen and educators, he traveled over 300,000 miles in two years. He has been president of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce and Rotary Club, and been active in other civic organizations. Williams was named national chairman of Citizens for Eisenhower in March of this year.

REP. EMANUEL CELLER—Democrat of New York, chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary. Born in Brooklyn, N. Y., in 1888, Mr. Celler attended public schools, was graduated from Columbia College in 1910 and from Columbia University Law School in 1912. He was admitted to the bar and began practice that same year. He organized the Brooklyn National Bank, is a member of the board of Montrose Bank, and is on the advisory board of Manufacturers Trust Company. Celler has been an active member of the American Jewish Congress, B'nai B'rith and other organizations. In 1928 he was elected to the Sixty-eighth Congress and has been a member of each succeeding Congress.

Moderator: QUINCY HOWE—ABC Network commentator, Associate Professor of Journalism, University of Illinois.

FOR FURTHER STUDY OF THIS WEEK'S TOPIC

Background Questions

1. Is the contention that this is a normally Democratic country correct?
2. Must the Republicans rely on dissatisfied Democrats and independents to win in November? Or was Taft's assumption that a Republican victory depends on getting out the normally non-voting public correct?
3. Can Eisenhower heal the rift in the Republican Party and woo the dissatisfied Democrats and independents at the same time?
4. Is there such a thing as an independent voter?
5. Is there a large group of disaffected Democrats in the United States today? If so, why?
 - a. Has the Korean war stimulated dissatisfaction?
 - b. Are taxes and inflation the issues which may give the election to the Republicans?
 - c. Have scandals and corruption in government affected the potential Democratic vote?
 - d. To what extent will concern for the two-party system and a desire for a change to strengthen the system prevail?
6. Will this campaign descend into a war of personalities, with all the bitterness involved? Or will it rest on issues?
7. Will Eisenhower disassociate himself from the Republican Congressional record?
8. Can Stevenson disassociate himself from the record of the Truman administration?
9. Will the solid South remain solidly in the Democratic camp?
 - a. Has the nomination of Senator Sparkman as Democratic Vice Presidential candidate insured Southern Democratic allegiance?
 - b. Has the North-South rift in the Democratic Party been healed or will Eisenhower make strong inroads in the South?
10. Will Senator Sparkman's nomination alienate the Northern liberal vote as a whole or the Negro vote specifically?
11. Can Eisenhower be expected to take a strong stand on civil rights if he is wooing the Southern vote?
12. To what extent will the issue of communists in government be brought into the campaign?
 - a. Was the selection of Senator Nixon as Eisenhower's running-mate designed to strengthen the Republican offensive on this issue?
 - b. Will the fact that Governor Stevenson knew Alger Hiss and made a deposition concerning Hiss' good reputation be much of a Republican talking point?